## FILED

DEC - 3 2004

## BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION OF THE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA

IN THE MATTER OF AN INACTIVE MEMI	BER ) No. 01-1792
OF THE STATE BAR OF ARIZONA,	)
PAUL NALABANDIAN, Bar No. 019920	) ) )
RESPONDENT.	) DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION ) REPORT

This matter came before the Disciplinary Commission of the Supreme Court of Arizona on November 13, 2004, pursuant to Rule 58(e), Ariz. R. S. Ct., for consideration of the Hearing Officer's Report filed September 21, 2004, recommending acceptance of the Tender of Admissions and Agreement for Discipline by Consent (Agreement) and Joint Memorandum in Support of Agreement for Discipline by Consent (Joint Memorandum) providing for a censure and costs of these disciplinary proceedings.

## **Decision**

The Commission's standard of review is set forth in Rule 58(b), which states that the Commission reviews questions of law *de novo*. In reviewing findings of fact made by a hearing officer, the Commission applies a clearly erroneous standard. Mixed findings of fact and law are also reviewed *de novo*. State v Blackmore, 186 Ariz. 630, 925 P.2d 1347 (1996) citing State v. Winegar, 147 Ariz. 440, 711 P.2d 579 (1985).

Therefore, having found no findings of fact clearly erroneous, the nine members of the Commission by a majority of eight recommend adopting and incorporating by

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Commissioners Nelson and Osborne did not participate in these proceedings. Mary Durand, from Phoenix, and former Commissioner Jack Potts, M.D., from Phoenix participated as ad hoc members.

	reference the Hearing Officer's findings of fact, conclusions of law,3 and recommendation	
1	for a censure and costs. The Hearing Officer's Report is attached herein as Exhibit A.	
2	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 3rd day of December, 2004.	
3	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	
4	Lo randum	
5	Craig B. Mehrens, Chair Disciplinary Commission	
6		
7	Original filed with the Disciplinary Clerk this <u>3</u> day of <u>Dicember</u> , 2004.	
8	Conv of the foregoing mailed	
9	Copy of the foregoing mailed this 3 <sup>rd</sup> day of Dicember, 2004, to:	
10	Jeffrey Messing	
1	Hearing Officer 9X	
	Poli & Ball, P.L.C. 2999 North 44 <sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 500	
12	Phoenix, AZ 85018-7252	
13	Part N. Jahan Stan	
4	Paul Nalabandian Respondent	
	901 North Nelson Street, No. 704	
15	Arlington, VA 22203-0001	
6	Denise M. Quinterri	
17	Bar Counsel	
	State Bar of Arizona	
18	111 West Monroe, Suite 1800	
9	Phoenix, AZ 85003-1742	
20	by: Keveigand	
21	/mps	
22		
23		
ເວ		

24

25

26

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Commissioner Orozco was opposed and concluded that a two month suspension was

appropriate.

The Commission notes the presence of mitigating factor 9.32(f) inexperience in the practice of law but determined the presence of this factor would not affect the outcome.